

## REMARKS

Consideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10, 14, 18-22 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As previously asserted by the Examiner, allegedly the claims contain subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the applicants, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, with respect to claims 9, 10, 14 and 18-22, the Examiner asserts that specification does not support the language “at least one unreacted polyalkene derived from C<sub>2</sub>- to C<sub>20</sub>-alkenes.” The Examiner had previously stated that the

“only recitation regarding unreacted polyalkene is in the examples. In these examples, applicant uses PIB. There is no indication that applicant contemplated adding any other unreacted polyalkenes to the formulations.”

See paragraph bridging pages 2-3 of the August 9, 2005 Office Action.

Claims 9, 10, 14, 18, 19, 20 and 32 have been amended above to specify that the unreacted polyalkene is PIB. As set forth by the Examiner this amendment is supported by the originally filed specification.

With respect to claims 30-31, specifically the Examiner had previously asserted that the specification did not support a number average molecular weight of “about 208” for the PIB-cresol moiety. Claims 30 and 31 have been amended above to obviate this § 112, first paragraph, rejection.

Entry and consideration of these amendments are in order as these amendments do not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, do not raise new matter issues, and would place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 10, 14, 18-22 and 30-32 under § 112, first paragraph, is in order and requested.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stayner (U.S. Patent No. 2,786,745.) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 9 and 10 have been amended above to specify that the unreacted polyalkene is polyisobutylene. The Stayner reference does not disclose or suggest polyisobutylene as the unreacted olefin in its composition.

Entry and consideration of these amendments are in order as these amendments do not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, do not raise new matter issues, and would place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Withdrawal of this rejection is in order and requested.

Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stayner '745 and EP 827999. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 has been amended above to specify that the unreacted polyalkene is polyisobutylene. The Stayner reference does not disclose or suggest polyisobutylene as the unreacted olefin in its composition, nor such a composition in combination with both a fuel and a detergent. The addition of EP '999 does not overcome the deficiencies of Stayner.

Entry and consideration of this amendment are in order as this amendment does not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, does not raise new matter issues, and would place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Withdrawal of this rejection is in order and requested.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that presently pending claims 9, 10, 14, 18-22 and 30-32 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and a timely allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by Applicants' undersigned

Appl. No. 10/046,823  
Amendment dated May 26, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action dated January 30, 2006

representative is desirable and/or necessary, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. §1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1135 under Order Number 7391/72568. This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

By: 

Samuel P. Burkholder  
Registration No. 40,541

**Customer No. 42798**

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY  
1801 K Street, N.W. - Suite 401L  
Washington, DC 20006-1201  
Telephone: (202) 419-7000  
Facsimile: (202) 419-7007